

ANARCHY REVISITED: AN INQUIRY INTO THE PUBLIC EDUCATION DILEMMA*

ROBERT H. CHAPPELL

Professional Teacher Program, University of Maine

Public schooling has become a prodigious bureaucratic institution that operates as a rigorous maintenance system. Its function is to inculcate the masses with acceptable ideologies and to weed out dissenters whose recalcitrant behavior and spontaneity are viewed as dangerous to the democratic tenets of the United States. As compulsory attendance laws surfaced and were enacted, the educational monolith became ever more securely entrenched in American society. Public education has become a breakwater interrupting the dynamics of inquiry, dissent and innovation which are essential to democracy and to the human condition.

In light of the above it seems timely to reevaluate the historical critiques of public education that apparently have largely been ignored, misinterpreted and misconstrued. A revitalization and reexamination of the major criticisms of the 19th and 20th century anarchists could provide a catalyst which might revitalize the arrested development of American education and life.

The major anarchist critics of education, William Godwin, Peter Kropotkin, Pierre-Joseph Proudhon, Mikhail Bakunin, Francisco Ferrer, Leo Tolstoy and Max Stirner, all believed to varying degrees that man was essentially a benign creature with a potential for goodness. However, they suggested that the habits and institutions of authority manifested in economics, politics, education, and in some

cases religion, only served to warp the natural goodness and wisdom that is the essence of man and mankind. Consequently, significant educational change must express the natural sentiments of an unstructured mass who, through the association and utilization of intellectual communes and cooperatives will arrive at a new synthesis — a new direction for American education.

This paper will be primarily concerned with identification and documentation of the educational viewpoints espoused by the European anarchists of the nineteenth century. A second section will highlight the ideas of two of the prominent contemporary opponents of public schooling, Ivan Illich and the late Paul Goodman. Following this, a third section will attempt to depict the commonalities between the European precursors and the contemporary "deschoolers".

William Godwin (1756–1836) is considered to be the first European to develop a comprehensive anarchistic critique in his *Enquiry Concerning Political Justice* (1793). His blatant attack on government, which he viewed as an unnecessary evil that should be introduced as sparingly as possible, and his belief in man's capacity to develop his intellect independently, were to form the foundations of the anarchistic tradition.^[1] His ideal society was egalitarian and completely anarchistic, but his abhorrence of violence precluded revolution as a means to this end. Godwin tolerated the idea of a loosely knit democracy as a transitory phase evolving into an ultimately stateless society.

Godwin's opposition to a system of national education was based upon a maxim of the

*The original version of this article was prepared for the Summer Research Seminar on the Opponents of Public Schooling, held in New York City, June–August 1977, and sponsored by the Center for Independent Education and the Center for Libertarian Studies.

Enlightenment — social progress could only come about through the development and application of human reason. Godwin believed that human reason and individuality were antithetical to a state controlled educational system which would serve to bolster the power of the political machinery of the state.

... the project of a national education ought uniformly to be discouraged on account of its obvious alliance with national government. This is an alliance of a more formidable nature than the old and much contested alliance of church and state. Before we put so powerful a machine under the direction of so ambiguous an agent, it behoves us to consider well what it is that we do. Government will not fail to employ it, to strengthen its hands, and perpetuate its institutions.^[12]

Godwin also dismissed the possibility of the participation of the church in education. The church was an antiquated and dogmatic institution that indoctrinated the masses with ideas that were static and restrictive.

... even in the petty institutions of Sunday Schools, the chief lessons that are taught are a superstitious veneration for the Church of England, and to bow to every man in a handsome coat. All this is directly contrary to the true interests of mankind. All this must be unlearned before they begin to be wise.^[13]

Godwin's understanding of the Sunday Schools' role in education is worth noting. In Burton Pollin's thesis, *Education and Enlightenment in the Works of William Godwin*, the author indicates that there is room to believe that the English Sunday Schools, set up by Roger Raikes of Gloucester in 1780, were intended to imbue poor children with a sense of discipline through religious and elementary education. After the development of the Sunday School unions (1785), these schools were widely regarded as institutions of social control that did not in any way limit the cheap supply of child labour.^[14]

Godwin's intense polemic against the proponents of national education (e.g. George Dryer, Mary Hayes, Thomas Paine, Edmund Burke) dismissed the argument that a national system could be defended as supplying the citizen with a rudimentary appreciation of the law. Godwin believed that just law was self-evident to the rational man and could be differentiated from the technical law manufactured and interpreted by the courts. The train-

ing in these technical aspects of law would be superfluous within a proper condition of society. Because this condition of society was an ideal and not yet a reality, Godwin conceded a limited role of social control to the government. In his ongoing argument against national education, he declared, in the second edition of *Enquiry Concerning Political Justice* (1796),

It is not the business of government . . . to become the preceptor of its subjects. Its office is not to inspire our virtues, that would be a hopeless task; it is merely to check these excesses, which threaten the general security.^[15]

Godwin was not inclined to deny the urgent need to improve literacy and to develop a wider and a deeper culture in society. He felt that this could be accomplished through the use of literature^[16] and through voluntary discussion groups led by cadres of the enlightened which would disperse knowledge by educating an ever increasing number of people. Needless to say, the Government and the Church would have no part in this voluntary undertaking.^[17]

Godwin detected an inherent problem in his informal and voluntary system of education. He pointed out that it would be difficult to find a substantial number of enlightened teachers for most had been indoctrinated by the teachings of Church and State. Apart from a small group of friends who shared his educational views (Thomas Holcroft, a liberal novelist and playwright; David Williams, a spokesman for advanced educational views in *Lectures on Education*, and a handful of others^[18]), the vast majority of pedagogues were imbued with a sense of servility to the state, in Godwin's opinion. It should be noted that Godwin did make some limited concessions to public education in his essay of "Of Public and Private Education" in *The Enquirer; Reflections on Education, Manners, and Literature* (1797).^[19] These concessions on the advantage of the socializing aspects of public schooling as opposed to private education, could have been prompted by Godwin's realization that the enlightened teacher was an endangered species. It is more likely that his partial acknowledgment of public education was due to the public opinion of the time (1797). Because of the dismal failure of the French Revolution, which

had resulted in autocratic rule by a vicious oligarchy, most of the antigovernment literature espousing individual freedom was considered by many to be insidious. In February, 1793, *An Enquiry Concerning Political Justice* was considered by many to be a major philosophical treatise worthy of praise. But by the end of the Terror in 1794 and certainly by 1797, Wordsworth, Coleridge and the great majority of the English intellectual community had turned against both the revolution and Godwin's anarchism.

Godwin's partial acknowledgement of public education could also have arisen from the influence of his wife Mary Wollstonecraft whom he met in 1791 and married in March of 1797.^[10] Mary Wollstonecraft was a proponent of free government coeducation, the central idea of her major work, *A Vindication of the Rights of Women* (1792).

However, the major anarchistic tenets developed in *Political Justice* (1793) later reappeared in *The Enquirer*. The educational revision that appeared in the latter can be simply explained as a concession to Godwin's critics,^[11] since his attack on national education was not deleted in the second and third editions of *Political Justice* in 1796 and 1798.

Godwin's views on education can be summarized as follows: the instrument for moral, political and basic education cannot be associated with any government or ecclesiastical institution, nor can this education be carried out by any educational bodies whether secular or religious. Education can only be developed by social interaction and communication guided by groups of enlightened preceptors who will investigate a variety of topics and share their conclusions. "Their hearers will be instigated to impart their acquisitions to still other hearers, and the circle of instruction will perpetually increase. Reason will spread, and not a brute and unintelligent sympathy."^[12]

William Godwin's radical critique of society and national education appears to be relatively benign when compared with the thoughts of Max Stirner (1806-1856). In his profoundly original monograph, *The Ego and His Own* (1844) Stirner lashed out at any and all forms of

authority and indoctrination.

Just as the schoolmen philosophized only inside the belief of the church . . . without ever throwing a doubt upon this belief; as authors fill whole folios on the State without calling in question the fixed idea of the State itself, as our newspapers are crammed with politics because they are conjured into the fancy that man was created to be a zoon politician — so also subjects vegetate in subjection, virtuous people in virtue, liberals in humanity, without ever putting these fixed ideas of theirs to the searching knife of criticism. Undislogeable, like a madman's delusion, those thoughts stand on a firm footing, and he who doubts them — lays hands on the sacred.^[13]

Stirner's central argument was the ownership of self which can be described as absolute individuality. To Stirner, liberal humanism was as dangerous as any form of government for it had become the church of the secular age and therefore suppressed individual initiative and freedom of will. Stirner's critique of education follows suit. The implicit danger of educational methodology was that the internalization of knowledge served to control the will of the individual when, in fact, the opposite should occur. Knowledge should be used by the individual when, in fact, the opposite should occur. Knowledge should be used by the in-

In *The False Principle of Our Education* (1842), which appeared in Karl Marx's paper *Neue Rheinische Zeitung*, Stirner indicated that knowledge and the school were synonymous with life. The free man would educate himself through unstructured experiences, since any pedagogical influence would impede the path to freedom and result in a state of submissiveness.^[14] Stirner made a distinction between the free man and an educated man. The educated man was subservient to his thoughts which were dominated by acceptable social values dictated by the state. The free man or egoist was responsible only to his individual will. The will was the master of his knowledge and thoughts.

Within a historical context Stirner argued that, following the Reformation, the exclusive humanistic mode of education based on the classics raised its beneficiaries above the masses who regarded the educated man as an authority.

. . . education as a power, raised him who possessed it over the weak, who lacked it, and the educated man counted in his circle . . . as the mighty the powerful, the imposing one: for he was an authority.^[15]

The development of universal schooling which arose out of the age of the Enlightenment mitigated the authority that had been given to the classical scholar. This new system of popular education was based upon a practical and useful curriculum that was designed to prepare the citizen for an operative life. Stirner rejected the humanist approach because of its explicit master-slave connotation. However, universal schooling was as dangerous to the quest for a free will as was its historical predecessor. The authority manifested in public schooling was not based upon the possession of classical knowledge but rather upon the authority of a "practical and useful" ideology — pragmatism. Stirner believed that the socialization process in a system of national education was abhorrent. For any metaphysical veneration (in this case the worshipping of pragmatism) would impede if not extinguish the natural development of an egoist's free will. Universal education, under the guise of pragmatism, was a refined system of indoctrination that maintained the authority of the State. This process of inculcation centered upon the teacher-student relationship. The student's freedom of will was sacrificed to an increasing belief that beneficial education was inextricably linked to the expertise of teacher and institutions.^[16]

Stirner unequivocally denounced any institutionalized form of education. He would have rejected those attempts at reforming institutionalized schooling that held on to the concepts of the teacher and the school (e.g. Ferrer's Modern School, Tolstoy's Yasnaya Polyana, etc.). Stirner's concept of education was directly related to the idea of unrestricted self development. Education was life and socialization was a product of culture not of the schools.

Mikhail Alexandrovitch Bakunin (1814-1876) is considered by many to be the father of the contemporary ideology of anarchy, at least in its collective sense. Bakunin was an ardent revolutionary, who not only professed a doctrine of collective anarchy but also actively participated in the 1848 revolutions in Paris, Dresden and Prague as well as the insurrection in Lyons following the Franco-Prussian war. Bakunin was profoundly affected by Pierre-

Joseph Proudhon's political conception of federated producers' cooperatives that would spontaneously arise from below. This concept was reiterated by Bakunin in his work *Statism and Anarchy* (1873):

We believe that the people will be happy and free only when they build their own life by organizing themselves from below upwards, by means of autonomous and totally free association, subject to no tutelage but exposed to the influence of diverse individuals and parties enjoying mutual freedom.^[17]

Bakunin rejected national education as it existed before the coming anarchist revolution. His reason was that a national system of education served the interests of the state and not of the people. These interests were essentially socio-economic as the government acted to preserve the disparities of wealth and class in a country.

This [governmental oppression of the working class] is the sole aim of a governmental organization, of the permanent conspiracy of the government against the people. And this conspiracy, openly avowed as such, embraces the entire diplomacy, the internal administration — military, civil, police, courts, finances, and education — and the Church.^[18]

Bakunin believed that society, in a natural state, was a collective humanity independent of all control. Bakunin's understanding of society as a mutual interdependence of individuals, voluntarily cooperating in all endeavors, was later to become a central theme in Peter Kropotkin's anarcho-communism. Bakunin propounded the idea that the only necessary authorities for man were the laws of his own nature and those of the environment. And since in the ideal society no other form of compulsion would be permissible, man must understand these natural laws of society and the environment.

The principal function of the post-revolutionary society would be to educate its members in order to preserve the harmonious and effective operation of the new social order. Bakunin's educational scheme was to be based upon a scientific inquiry into nature and society. He gave it the name of integral education for it encompassed both the theoretical and practical aspects necessary for the fullest development of an individual's potential.^[19] The programme of integral education was sub-

divided into three areas of inquiry, each one a requisite for the next. The first area was a theoretical study of the sciences, which would teach each individual the rudiments of the scientific method. After the individual had gained a general understanding of science, he or she would select a specific field in which to undertake a concentrated study. The second part of Bakunin's proposal was to be technical training where each individual would be taught a useful vocation. Following this, a third area was concerned with the study of morals and ethics.

Alongside of scientific and industrial education there will necessarily be a practical education, or rather a series of experiments in morality, not divine but human morality. Divine morality is based upon two immoral principals, respect for authority and contempt for humanity; but human morality, on the contrary, is based upon contempt for authority and respect for freedom and humanity.^[11]

Bakunin's system of education was unavoidably compulsory for he believed so long as there existed two or more degrees of education in society this would result inevitably in class distinctions. He did not deny that some individuals were naturally endowed with a greater propensity to learn, but he felt that these natural differences were exaggerated and that most of them could not be attributed to nature but to the educational differences prevailing in the existing society. Immediately following the revolution, Bakunin admitted, his system of integral education would not maintain the then current level of scientific exploration and discovery but it would greatly reduce the number of ignorant people.^[20]

Admittedly, Bakunin's system of integral education seems to have an authoritarian flavor about it. However, compulsory attendance was only to be enforced during the initial stages of the education of the young. Afterward, there would be a free entry and exit policy, as witness the following quotation:

But these schools [of integral education] should be free from even the slightest application or manifestation of the principle of authority. They will not be schools in the accepted meaning, but popular academies, in which neither pupils or master will be known, but where the people come freely to get, if they find it necessary, free instruction, and in which, rich in experience, they will teach many things to their professors who shall bring them the knowledge that they

lack. This then will be a sort of intellectual fraternity between educated youth and the people.^[21]

It should be noted that Bakunin's ideal of integral education could only exist in a truly egalitarian society. Also his belief in productive communes and cooperatives, voluntarily associated in a loosely knit federation, tends to preclude any similarities between integral education and a system of national schooling. Bakunin's abhorrence of public education in the bourgeois State can be successfully summarized in the following quotation:

But you [bourgeois socialists] do not teach them, you poison them by trying to inculcate all the religious, historical, political, juridical and economic prejudices which guarantee your existence, but which at the same time destroy their intelligence, take the mettle out of their legitimate indignation and debilitate their will.^[22]

One of Bakunin's contemporaries who generally subscribed to the collectivist tenets of anarchism was Pierre-Joseph Proudhon (1809—1865). Proudhon is popularly recognized for his contributions in the economic realm, namely his proposal of a natural banking system which supported the ideas of free credit and equitable exchange. Proudhon was also indirectly responsible for the futuristic conception of society as a free federation of working men's cooperatives. It is probable that the social reorganization that Proudhon proposed was essentially a restatement of Charles Fourier's concept of the phalansterian communities.^[23] His first major publication was *What is Property?* (1840) and in this work, Proudhon became the first advocate of a society without government to call himself an anarchist.

Proudhon's views on education come significantly close to those of Mikhail Bakunin. Proudhon, in his *Idea of the Revolution in the Nineteenth Century* (1851), suggested that a system of state-controlled education, through its separation of professional and practical instruction, served to make a distinction between classes, resulting in governmental tyranny and the subjection of the working class. Proudhon argued against a sense of superiority that students gained when they embarked upon a solely theoretical education, devoid of practical application. When educa-

tion is integrated or "... when it becomes at once a matter of training the mind and of application to practical affairs in the workshop and in the house . . ."^[24], the government's control of it would inevitably disappear, for the disparities between theory and practice would be dissolved and the corresponding class distinctions would no longer provide fuel for the suppressive government machinery. The following quotations should illustrate this point.

If the school of mines is anything else than the actual work in the mines, accompanied by the studies suitable for the mining industry, the school will have for its object, to make, not miners but chiefs of miners, aristocrats.^[25]

and

It was not for the People that the Polytechnic, the Normal School, the military school at St. Cyr, the School of Law, were founded; it was to support, strengthen, and fortify the distinction between classes, in order to complete and make irrevocable the split between the working class and the upper class.^[26]

Proudhon supported a complete decentralization of schooling. He felt that the small communities, workingmen's associations and agricultural communes should, at their own discretion, select a teacher who could provide a specific service corresponding to the wants and needs of the community. The teacher would not have to be certified by the state and indeed could be self-taught. Proudhon specified that the relationship between the community and the teacher would be a free contract subject to competition. Proudhon's conception of a free contract was a working relationship between an individual and one or more of his fellow citizens. The fulfillment of the contract was not based upon any legal maxims upheld by the state, but rather on the individual's moral will.

It is probable that some of Pierre-Joseph Proudhon's contempt for public schooling was due to his personal education. His comprehensive knowledge and his expertise in Latin and Hebrew were acquired through self-education. Proudhon's educational emphasis on decentralization and on the integration of the theoretical and practical, were some of the salient characteristics within his revolutionary program.

No revolution henceforward will be fruitful if a recreation of public education is not its crowning feature. . . . The organization of education is at once the condition of equality and the sanction of progress.^[27]

The theory of mutual aid, which was the thesis of Peter Alexeyevitch Kropotkin's (1842-1921) anarcho-communism refuted Charles Darwin's evolutionary emphasis on natural selection. Kropotkin argued that the real struggle for existence took place in a collective sense. This collectivity was represented by the adaptation of all individuals to those conditions that were best for the survival of the entire species. The struggle was between the species and the environment, not between different members of a species. Kropotkin believed that the history of man had been characterized by cooperation. Voluntary cooperation was ultimately the basis of all human development. He asserted that anarcho-communism or communism without government was the synthesis of two ideals that mankind had pursued throughout the ages — economic and political liberty.

Kropotkin credited compulsory national education with the preservation of state government. He indicated that, for the most part, all books and journals, both academic and popular, espoused a veneration of government.

Kropotkin foresaw the possibility that compulsory public schooling could successfully inculcate values that would eliminate independent thinking and criticism.

We are so perverted by education which from infancy seeks to kill in us the spirit of revolt, and to develop that of submission to authority; we are so perverted by this existence under the ferrule of a law, which regulates every event in life — our birth, our education, our development, our love, our friendship — that if this state of things continues, we shall lose all initiative, all habit of thinking for ourselves.^[28]

The educational approach that Kropotkin propounded seems to embrace most of the critiques and alternatives that have been expounded so far. However, there is always an exception to any generalization. In Kropotkin's pamphlet *Modern Science and Anarchism* (1913), he attacked Max Stirner's belief in the full development of the individual as a selective educational process, that would cater only to the most

gifted and would therefore have as its result the process of an existing educational monopoly by the few. Kropotkin added that this educational monopoly could only be maintained under the oppressive wing of a state; "... the claims of these individualists necessarily end in a return to the state idea and to the same coercion which they so fiercely attack themselves".^[29] Whether this critique can be justified is a matter of interpretation. Perhaps Max Stirner can clarify the point.

In this universal education, therefore, because the lowest and the highest meet together in it, we come upon the true equality of all for the first time, the equality of free people: only freedom is equality.^[30]

Kropotkin agreed with Proudhon and Bakunin on the necessity of integrating theory and practice in an educational system to avoid class distinction.

Repeating the formulation of Proudhon, we say: if a naval academy is not itself a ship with sailors who enjoy equal rights and receive a theoretical education, then it will produce not sailors but officers to supervise sailors. . . .^[31]

Kropotkin defended this argument by alluding to the fact that many of the great intellects in history necessarily combined brain work with manual work or innovations with handicrafts. Galileo manufactured his own telescopes; Newton learned how to grind the lenses for his experiments in optics; Linnaeus became acquainted with botany while helping his father in the garden. Kropotkin pointed out that industrialization and the inherent division of labor have caused the worker to lose his intellectual interest in production and therefore his innovative capacity.

Kropotkin advocated a complete education combining a thorough knowledge of science and of handicraft. He dismissed attempts to set up schools of technical education because these served to maintain the division between manual and mental labor. Kropotkin emphasized self-discovery within the scientific schooling of the young and felt that the educational method of combining practical experience with theoretical insight would facilitate and expedite the learning process. His vision of public schooling was that it would be free, not compulsory and not limited in the curricular sense.^[32] The educa-

tion would be carried on by the various cooperatives and associations that were to be the social units following the elimination of the state.

The following quotations seem to summarize Kropotkin's opposition to public schooling and his vision of an ideal education. These thoughts were expressed in a letter from Peter Kropotkin to Francisco Ferrer, congratulating Ferrer on the founding of the educational review, *L'Ecole Renovée*:

Above all, education in the true sense of the word: that is to say the formation of the moral being, the active individual, full of initiative, enterprise, courage, freed from the timidity of thought which is the distinctive feature of the educated man of your period — and at the same time sociable, communistic by instinct, equal with and capable of feeling his equality with every man throughout the universe; starting emancipated from the religious, narrowly individualistic, authoritarian principles which the school inculcates We must come to the merging of manual with mental labor, as preached by Fourier and the International . . . we will then see the immense economy of time that will be realized by the young brain developed at once by the work of hand and mind.^[33]

For the most part, this paper has dealt with critiques of, and hypothetical alternatives to, public schooling. It would be fruitful to investigate the practical application of libertarian education. Francisco Ferrer and Leo Tolstoy organized libertarian schools in Barcelona, Spain, and at Yasnaya Polyana, Russia, respectively. Both of these men believed that education and not social revolution was the proper means of implementing social change.

Francisco Ferrer's (1859–1909) Modern School was established in September, 1901, in Barcelona.^[34] Between 1884 and 1885, Ferrer was involved in a popular republican rebellion led by General Villacampa against the oppressive Spanish regime. The Spanish republican rebels were subdued and those who escaped persecution and arrest fled to foreign countries. Ferrer managed to escape to France, and in Paris he was introduced to the principles of the Modern School. The tradition of the Modern School in France was developed by a group of people, particularly Louise Michel, who originated the movement within her school on Mont-martie; Paul Robin, who set up a

school for the underprivileged at Cempuis; and Madelaine Vernet and Sebastian Faure who established a communal school called La Ruche (The Beehive), based on libertarian tenets.^[35]

Ferrer's Modern School was financed by one of his students, a Mlle. Meunier, who in 1900 unconditionally bequeathed to Ferrer a sum of £30,000. Ferrer attempted to provide a privately financed system of education that would be concerned with developing a sense of self-ownership and social awareness, independent of the dogmas of state or church.

If modern pedagogy means an effort towards the realization of a new and more just form of society; if it means that we propose to instruct the rising generation in the causes which have brought about and maintain the lack of social equilibrium; if it means that we are anxious to prepare the race for better days, freeing it from religious fiction and from all ideas of submission to an inevitable socio-economic inequality; we cannot entrust it to the state nor to other official organisms which necessarily maintain existing privileges and support the laws which at present consecrate the exploitation of one man by another....^[36]

Ferrer believed in the principle of a sliding tuition rate that would allow children from all walks of life to attend the Modern School. A private school that demanded exorbitant fees would preserve class privilege and disrupt social harmony.

The curriculum of the Modern School utilized the study of the natural sciences in order to familiarize the students with a scientific mode of inquiry. "A rigorous logic, applied with discretion . . . established intellectual harmony and gave . . . a progressive disposition to their wills . . . —all were enabled to see the errors of others as well as their own, and they moved more and more to the side of common sense."^[37] It is revealing to note that Ferrer has great difficulty in finding educational sources and texts were not riddled with absolute assertions and rigid principles. When the library of the Modern School was opened, it contained but one work—*The Adventures of Nono* by Jean Groue. The Book was a social satire that dramatically contrasted the social evils of the present with the future delights in the "land of Autonomy".^[38] In July of 1909, Ferrer called a conference of his teachers to consider book selections for the fall semester. Of the new

publications discussed, special emphasis was given to Peter Kropotkin's just published *Great French Revolution*.^[39]

Ferrer's system of education, especially the curricular aspects of the Modern School, has been attacked as dogmatic. It is true that the teachers in the school and a great deal of the literature read there were imbued with a sense of anarchy.^[40] However, the school did lay great emphasis on the scientific method, and Ferrer always insisted that there was an objective set of facts that could be learned without subjecting the student to an ideology.^[41] Ferrer himself indicated that the Modern School was not intended to inculcate revolutionary ideals in the students:

I venture to say quite plainly: the oppressed and exploited have a right to rebel, because they have to reclaim their rights until they enjoy their full share in the common patrimony. The Modern School however has to deal with children, whom it prepares by instruction for the state of manhood, and it must not anticipate the cravings and hatreds, the adhesions and rebellions which *may* be fitting sentiments in the adult.^[42]

As was the case with Stirner and Godwin, Francisco Ferrer also anticipated the problem of finding rational educators who were not indoctrinated with the teachings of church and state. Ferrer, however, solved the problem:

Professional teachers have to undergo a special preparation for the task of imparting scientific and rational instruction. . . . The solution of the problem was very difficult, because there was no other place but the rational school itself for making this preparation. . . . Nevertheless, in order to complete my work, I established a Rationalist Normal School for the education of teachers, under the direction of an experienced master and with the cooperation of the teachers in the Modern School.^[43]

Ferrer believed that the idea of rational education developed at the Modern School would be a model for other independent educational institutions in Spain. There were a substantial number of societies interested in scientific and rational education, especially The Republican Fraternities, the Centers of Instruction, and various working men's organizations. Between 1901 and 1909 Ferrer organized 109 schools in Spain.^[44] Ferrer's influence was not restricted to the Peninsula, as his concept of the Modern School was adopted in the United

States, specifically in the form of the Modern Schools in New York City and in Shelton, New Jersey.

Ferrer's life came to an abrupt end in October 1909. The Spanish government accused Ferrer of instigating an insurrection in Barcelona. Following a mock trial, in which defense evidence was confiscated by the police, Ferrer was found guilty and sentenced to be shot. On October 13th he was executed. Yet in 1912, the Supreme Military Council of Spain was forced to declare that no single act of violence could be directly or indirectly traced to Ferrer.^[45]

The central idea of the new "Libertarian" education for which Tolstoy and Sebastian Faure have worked, and in behalf of which Francisco Ferrer has died, is that the emphasis of education shall rest on the "drawing out" of the authentic nature of the child. In our schools of today . . . just the opposite principle is recognized. The object of the teacher is too often to impose something on the child, to stifle the pupils' real individuality, to make children as much alike as possible, all this must be changed.^[46]

Lev Nikolaevich Tolstoy (1828-1910) is popularly recognized for his contributions to literature, including *Anna Karenina*, *War and Peace*, and other works. Tolstoy approached anarchism in a non-violent and religious manner. His religion was an entirely ethical one which ignored ecclesiastical dogma and affirmed universal love and brotherhood. Christianity, as Tolstoy saw it, was incompatible with the state and its array of coercive institutions. He sought the solution to society's ills in changing the morals of individuals, and he considered the revolutionary approach of his contemporaries to be severely misguided.

Tolstoy's ideals of universal welfare and a brotherhood of man were to be realized through education. According to Tolstoy, the mission of education was to inspire and influence individuals so that they could appreciate truth and beauty and abhor cruelty and power. In the ideal stateless order, Tolstoy believed that "men are to be held together in societies in future by the mental influence which men who have made progress in knowledge exert upon the less advantaged."^[47] Knowledge was derived from conscious instruction in the pedagogical sense and from un-

conscious suggestion manifested in the social and natural environment and in the actions of the teacher.

Education, for Tolstoy, was a process of freeing the natural creativity in individuals through learning. Compulsory public schooling would only impede this process.

Every pupil is so long an anomaly at school as he has not fallen into the rut of this semi-animal condition. The moment the child has reached that state and has lost all his independence and originality, the moment there appear in him various symptoms of disease - hypocrisy, aimless lying, dullness and so forth - he no longer is an anomaly: he has fallen into the rut, and the teacher begins to be satisfied with him.^[48]

Tolstoy also opposed public schooling because he believed that a great part of the practical or vital education that people obtained was disassociated from any form of formal schooling. "Maybe it is easier for a workman to study Botany from plants, Zoology from animals, Arithmetic from the abacus, with which he has to deal, than from books."^[49] He felt that any system of education had to grow out of the people and could not be directed from a central authority.

. . . The government seems to be imposing the obligation of another, unfamiliar education on the masses, removing from them participation in their own affairs, and demanding from them not guidance and deliberation, but only submission.^[50]

Tolstoy detected the populace's attraction towards public education and saw how this demand would be utilized by the state in its ongoing process of centralization.

The need of education is just beginning freely to take germ in the masses. After the Manifesto of February 19th [the Russian government's proposal during the 1890's for public education], the people everywhere expressed their conviction that they now need a greater degree of education. . . . This conviction has found its expression in the fact that everywhere free schools have been rising in enormous numbers. The masses have been advancing on the paths on which the government would like to see them go.^[51]

Tolstoy criticized the University system as an intolerably rigid and elitist institution that was based upon "the dogma of the professors' papal infallibility". He saw that the university alienated the student from his family and community (institutions that Tolstoy cherished) and that most of his educational experience was useless.

He comes back to his home; all are strangers to him. . . . He shares neither their faith, nor their desires, and he prays not to their God, but to other idols. His parents are deceived, and the son frequently wishes to unite with them into one family but he no longer can do that. . . . But the deed is done, and the parents console themselves with the thought that such is now the age; that the present education is such that their son will make a career for himself somewhere else. . . .

Unfortunately . . . the parents are mistaken. . . . The information which he has acquired is of no use to anybody, no one gives him anything for it. Their only application is in literature and in pedagogy, that is, in the science dealing with the education of just such useless men as he.^[52]

The real university to Tolstoy, was a voluntary community of individuals who investigated topics of common interest that arose from the cultural background of the participants. There was no compulsion to attend — students and teachers gathered together freely and discussed matters that would have some significance, either in a theoretical or practical sense, in their own lives.

Tolstoy believed in educational progress, which he understood as a popular evolution towards equality of knowledge. However, he disagreed with the thought that one must teach in accordance with the demands of the time. The progressive demands of the time were essentially those principles that maintained the social standing of the educated gentry, the educated merchants and the official classes. Public schooling which inculcated "progressive" and "acceptable" beliefs and behavior was an insidious tool of the upper classes and/or the state.^[53] Tolstoy declared:

. . . we see, on the contrary, that the advocates of progress in this respect, judge precisely as did the old landed proprietors who assured everybody that for the peasants, for the state, and for humanity at large, there was nothing more advantageous than serfdom and manorial labor; the only difference is that the faith of the landed proprietors is old and unmasked, while the faith of the progressists is still fresh and in force.^[54]

In the 1860s Tolstoy implemented his proposed alternative modes of teaching, by establishing a school at his estate, Yasnaya Polyana. The school dismissed traditional authority, whether in the form of a required curriculum, examinations or punishments and rewards. Tolstoy believed that the initiative and originality of children could only develop in an

atmosphere of freedom. This did not imply disorder or indiscipline. Freedom, to Tolstoy "replaces an external artificial order by one that is internal, organic and genuine, one that springs from life itself like the regular and spontaneous working of an organism; one that is not felt as constraint".^[55] Freedom, in this sense, would provide a fertile atmosphere for self-expression and self-realization. The School at Yasnaya Polyana, according to the accounts of Tolstoy, was a successful but fleeting experiment. (The school was closed several years after its inception. This was largely due to government pressure and public opposition.)

Tolstoy explains that no one is ever rebuked for tardiness, but they never are tardy, except some of the older ones whose fathers, now and then, keep them back to do some work. In such cases, they come running to school at full speed, and all out of breath. The teacher may begin with arithmetic and pass over to geometry, or he may start on sacred history and end up with grammar. At times the teacher and pupils are so carried away, that instead of one hour, the class lasts three hours.^[56]

There is one other salient characteristic of the school at Yasnaya Polyana that most visibly distinguishes Tolstoy from other European anarchists. Tolstoy utilized the Bible, for he considered it to be the most comprehensive work available. "There is no book like the Bible to open up a new world to the pupil, and to make him without knowledge, love knowledge. . . . All the questions from the phenomena of Nature are explained by this book; all the primitive relations of men with each other, of the family, of the state, or religion, are for the first time consciously recognized in this book."^[57] The religious flavor of Tolstoy's anarchism should not be misconstrued as ecclesiastical dogmatism. For Tolstoy, Christianity was anarchy based on love.

We come now to the salient critiques and alternatives to contemporary public schooling suggested by Paul Goodman and Ivan Illich. We offer not a comprehensive enquiry but rather a succinct exposition of their thoughts on a public system of education.

The late Paul Goodman (1911 – 1971), ardently opposed the bureaucratic and stultifying proliferation of public schooling in the

United States. Goodman recognized the viability of a system of compulsory schooling in Jeffersonian times when people were taught to display "citizenly initiative", and revolutionary zeal. "Everybody had to become literate and study history, in order to make constitutional innovations and to be fired to defend free institutions, which was presumably the moral that history taught."^[58]

Goodman perceives compulsory public schooling as an unnecessary evil that should be introduced as sparingly as possible. The contemporary "school-monks": the administrators, professors, academic sociologists and licensed teachers have developed into a vast intellectual monolith that is venerated by society. This absurd worship of public schooling is based on the belief that social and economic advancement are inextricably related to the quality of education received.^[59] Goodman believes that the compulsory education system or any similar form of formal education is designed to inculcate a sense of subservience in the student, and to shape acceptable patterns of behavior and thought.

It is in the schools and from the mass media, rather than at home or from their friends, that the mass of our citizens in all classes learn that life is inevitably routine, depersonalized, venally graded; that it is best to toe the mark and shut up; that there is no place for spontaneity, open sexuality and free spirit. Trained in the schools they go on to the same quality of jobs, culture and politics. This is education, miseducation socializing to the national norms and regimenting to the nation's "needs"^[60]

At present when formal education swallows up so much time of life and pretends to be practical preparation for every activity, the ideological processing is especially deadly. Those who succumb to it have no wits of their own left and are robots.^[61]

Goodman claims that one's most valuable educational experiences occur outside the school. Participation in the activities of society should be the chief means of learning. Instead of requiring students to succumb to the theoretical drudgery of textbook learning, Goodman recommends that education be transferred into factories, museums, parks, department stores, etc, where the students can actively participate in their education. With an emphasis on voluntary education and intrinsic motivation, it is essential that there be a large

variety of educational opportunities.

Teacher certification can be dismissed as a state system of rubber stamping. Its inherent function is to insure the systematic indoctrination of state preceptors and to control the elements of supply and demand in the teaching profession. Incidental education would utilize the expertise of druggists, storekeepers, mechanics, etc. to introduce students to the realities of vocations or professions. There would be significant emphasis on science and technology.

Finally contemporary education must inevitably be heavily weighted toward the sciences. . . . Our aim must be to make a great number of citizens at home in a technological environment, not alienated from the machines we use, not ignorant as consumers, who can enjoy the humanistic beauty of the sciences, and above all, who can understand the morality of a scientific way of life.^[62]

The ideal schools would take the form of small discussion groups of no more than twenty individuals. As has been indicated, these groups would utilize any effective environment that would be relevant to the interest of the group. Such education would be necessarily non-compulsory, for any compulsion to attend places authority in an external body disassociated from the needs and aspirations of the students. Moreover, compulsion retards and impedes the students' ability to learn.

The basic intention behind the compulsory attendance laws is not only to insure the socialization process but also to control the labour supply quantitatively within an industrialized economy characterized by unemployment and inflation. The public schools and universities have become large holding tanks of potential workers.

The universities are no longer free intellectual communities that participate actively on society. Goodman feels that they have evolved into academic corporations that have alienated students and professors through formal administrative procedures.

My argument, then, is a simple one. The colleges and universities are, as they always have been, self-governing communities. But the personal relations in such communities have come less and less to consist in growing up, in the meeting of veterans and students, in teaching and learning, and more and more in every kind of communication, policing, regulation, and

motivation that is relative to administration. The community of scholars is replaced by a community of administrators and scholars with administrative mentalities, company men and time servers among the teachers, grade seekers and time servers among the students. And this new community mans a machine that, incidentally, turns out educational products.^[63]

Goodman's intense polemic against compulsory public schooling can be summarized by the following quotation from his *Compulsory Mis-education and The Community of Scholars*:

The school system as a whole, with its increasingly set curriculum, stricter grading, incredible amounts of testing, is already a vast machine to shape acceptable responses. Programmed instruction closes the windows a little tighter and it rigidifies the present departmentalization and dogma. But worst of all it tends to mummify the one lively virtue that any school does have, that is a community of youth and of youth and adults.^[64]

Ivan Illich (1927–) is popularly recognized for his critical exposé, *Deschooling Society*. Illich was born in Vienna and was educated in Rome's Gregorian University, where he received a master's degree in theology and philosophy, and at the University of Salzburg, where he received a doctorate in the philosophy of history. The most complete biography of Illich can be found in Francine Gray's *Divine Disobedience*. Illich's intense argument against compulsory public schooling generally reiterates Paul Goodman's critique, but Illich adds a revolutionary flavor to deschooling: the dismantling of the public education system would coincide with a pervasive abolition of all the suppressive institutions of society.

Illich condemns public schooling for a variety of reasons. The general theme is that the nature of man is incongruent with the centralized and institutionalized society of the technocrats. The paradigm of the technocratic society is the public school. It is venerated in a religious sense for it makes futile promises of economic advancement and social mobility to the modern proletariat. Illich maintains that this new world religion has to be disestablished from the state and that this will be a violent process.

The time of reformation, desecularization and the disestablishment of the school will bring processes

analogous to those which occur in the breakdown of established Churches . . . we will see struggles for investiture, struggles for local control and struggles for freedom from dogma. We will experience the rise of lay preachers, sectarianism, heresies, inquisitions and religious wars.^[65]

Illich charges public schooling with institutionalizing acceptable moral and behavioral standards and with constitutionally violating the rights of young adults. "Children are neither protected by the 1st amendment or the 5th when they stand before the secular priest. The teacher is at once the guide, teacher and administrator of a sacred ritual."^[66]

In the economic spectrum, the school alleviates the burden of unemployment by detaining significant numbers of would-be workers. Illich feels that compulsory public education is economically unsound and a useless waste of time.^[67] He suggests that tax revenues allocated to public education would be unquestionably put to better use by developing skill centers and an educational voucher system or edu-credit cards, as Illich refers to them.

Skill centers would be set up so that anyone at anytime could choose instruction among hundreds of available skills. These centers would be publicly financed, and each citizen's edu-credit card would entitle the holder to their use. Illich emphasizes on-the-job training and contends that trade schools should be a part of related industries rather than remain independent of them.

Instead of the trade school, we should think of a subsidized transformation of the industrial plant. It should be possible to obligate factories to serve as training centers during off-hours, for managers to spend part of their time planning and supervising this training, and for the industrial process to be so redesigned that it has educational value. If the expenditures for present schools were partly allocated to sponsor this kind of educational exploitation of existing resources, then the final results — both economic and educational — might be incomparably greater.^[68]

Illich subscribes to Goodman's belief that most of the useful education that people acquire is a by-product of work or leisure and not of the school. Illich refers to this process as "informal education". Only through this unrestricted and unregulated form of learning can the individual gain a sense of self-awareness and develop his creative capacity to its fullest extent. Illich also

concurs with Goodman's opposition to teacher certification for similar reasons. Licensing serves to discriminate between those who have acquired diplomas from public schooling and those who have not. Illich believes that industry and educational systems should not discriminate because of licenses but should provide performance tests for specific job-related skills.

Illich's ideal educational system would include the edu-credit cards and skill centers in addition to the central concept of "learning webs". This educational system would have three purposes: to provide access to available resources to all who want to learn; to empower all who want to share what they know; to find those who want to learn it from them; to furnish all who want to present an issue to the public with the opportunity to make their challenges known. The system of learning webs is aimed at individual freedom and expression in education by using society as the classroom. There would be reference services to index items available for study in laboratories, theatres, airports, libraries, etc.; skill exchanges — which would permit people to list their skills so that potential students could contact them; peer-matching, which would communicate an individual's interest so that he or she could find educational associates; reference services to educators at large, which would be a central directory of professionals, para-professionals and free-lancers.^[69] Illich's "web system" is a well-thought-out alternative to public schooling. Its emphasis on a prodigious supply of educational resources, individual freedom of choice, unrestricted accessibility, and self-development, all seem to provide a solution to the problems of compulsory public schooling. However, the viability of Illich's "web system" is dependent upon the principle of centralization. Centralization implies the creation of a bureaucracy that coordinates and manages a comprehensive system. In the case of the web system it appears that its management could be undertaken by a small group of people. This could lead to a system of education more frightening and Orwellian than the present state of affairs. This reasoning is pure supposition and should be taken as such.

The intellectual precursors of the contemporary opponents of compulsory public schooling, were for the most part the European anarchists of the nineteenth century. Ivan Illich has indicated that,

As far as my criticism of schooling is concerned, the most important direct influence of which I am aware is that of Mr. Everett Reimer. . . . The intensity of our joint exploration puts — in my opinion — other direct influences in the shadow. Among those 19th century authors whom you mention, Proudhon, Bakunin, Kropotkin and Stirner were certainly points of reference in our conversation.^[70]

Everett Reimer reiterates Illich's deschooling theme in his only major publication, *School is Dead: Alternatives in Education* (1971). It would appear that Reimer did not directly influence the work of Illich, but rather that their relationship was of mutual benefit. In the foreword to *School is Dead*, Reimer stated,

This book is the result of a conversation with Ivan Illich that has continued for fifteen years. We have talked of many things, but increasingly about education and school, and eventually, about alternatives to schools.^[71]

This would seem to indicate that the educational viewpoint of the European anarchists of the 19th century was the major influence upon the contemporary critique espoused by Ivan Illich.

Paul Goodman indicated in the introduction to Peter Kropotkin's *Memoirs of a Revolutionist* (1970 edition) that "Kropotkin's running critique of the system of formal education also continually strikes home".^[72]

In a general survey, all of these opponents of public schooling criticized the institution because of its perverse relationship with the government. The schools inculcated beliefs and behavior that were politically and economically beneficial to the power structure of the state.

The emphasis on the need to integrate theoretical and practical education is supported by Bakunin, Proudhon and Kropotkin, and this belief is reiterated in the proposals of Illich and Goodman. Proudhon's idea that both the theoretical and practical aspects of technical education should be carried out in the factories and in workingmen's associations is similar to Illich recommending that industry incorporate the trade schools of contemporary times. Goodman's support of the thesis of integral

education is evidenced by the following:

Dispense with the school building for a few classes; provide teachers and use the city itself as a school, its streets, cafeterias . . . and factories. Where feasible, it certainly makes more sense to teach using the real subject-matter than to bring an abstraction of the subject-matter into the school building as curriculum.^[73]

And other commonality is the basic belief that education is synonymous with life and that the most useful learning experiences are acquired outside the confines of the classroom. Goodman's and Illich's recognition of informal or incidental education is significantly close to Max Stirner's proposition that knowledge and school were integrated into life and could only be discovered through social interaction. Tolstoy follows suit, in his polemic against public schooling which refuted the necessity of learning to read and write.

Among people who stand at a low level of education, we notice that the knowledge or ignorance of reading and writing in no way changes the degree of their education. We see people who are well acquainted with all the facts necessary for farming and with a large number of interrelations of these facts, who can neither read nor write; as excellent military commanders, excellent merchants . . . and people simply educated by life who possess a great store of information and sound reasoning, based on that information. . . .^[74]

The concept that a system of national education serves to maintain class disparities is generally accepted by the European anarchists and by the contemporary deschoolers. However, there are specific ideological differences within this general consensus. The mutualist, collectivist and communist strains of anarchy as propounded by Proudhon, Bakunin and Kropotkin strongly emphasized the principle that national education would cater to the middle class and would be detrimental to the urban and agrarian proletariat. Ferrer and Tolstoy recognized the principle of class struggle but they were also concerned with the problem of self-ownership within the suppressive educational environment of the public schools. The individualist anarchism of Max Stirner was based upon the concept of an absolutely free development of the individual, and consequently disregarded the argument that a system of national education would cater to one class or

to another. Within this spectrum of anarchy, Illich and Goodman would probably come closest to Ferrer and Tolstoy. Both groups recognized that compulsory public schooling was designed to maintain the inherent class structure of society, but they also emphasized the negative effect that compulsory public schooling had on the individual. Godwin's conception of anarchism would place him much closer to the individualist strain of Stirner than to the socialistic principles of Bakunin, Proudhon and Kropotkin.

Another common element subscribed to by these opponents of public schooling was the belief in utilizing small educational groups. In many cases this would correspond to the social organization in a stateless society. All of the European anarchists supported the principle of a federation of small associations and it follows naturally that this idea would be applied to education.

The problem of finding adequate educational resources not imbued with the dogmatism of the state is explicitly indicated in the works of Godwin, Ferrer, Stirner, and Kropotkin:

We may open any book of sociology, history, law, or ethics: everywhere we find government, its organization, its deeds, playing so prominent a part that we grow accustomed to suppose that the state and the political man are everything. . . .^[75]

This problem is implied by both Goodman and Illich, for both recognize and identify the process of indoctrination that occurs in the public schools which utilize "acceptable" educational textbooks.

The curricular emphasis on science or upon developing a working knowledge of the scientific method seems to be a general trait of the the European anarchists. This emphasis has largely been adopted by both Goodman and Illich, although it has evolved into an affirmation of technical education.^[76] Mikhail Bakunin clearly indicated the necessity of acquiring an education based on science.

Since no mind . . . is capable of embracing . . . all the sciences, and . . . since a general knowledge of all sciences is absolutely necessary for the complete development of the mind, instruction divides naturally into two parts: the general one, giving the principal elements of all sciences . . . and the special part, necessarily divided into several groups or faculties,

every one of which embraces a certain number of mutually complementary sciences.¹⁷⁷

This paper has been concerned with depicting the common elements between the 19th century anarchistic opponents of public schooling and two contemporary counterparts — Paul Goodman and Ivan Illich. All held to varying degrees that education was experientially synonymous with life. Pedagogy should be viewed as an unfettered and ongoing enquiry into those areas of individual and collective interest(s), which in their entirety define the perimeters of their culture or cultures. Educational authority, imposed from above, and manifest in governmental or ecclesiastical institutions, only creates a synthetic environment that is antithetical to learning. Educational authority and organization should be an internal function and responsibility of freely formed communes and cooperatives, i.e. those social units envisioned as the basic units of a new and liberated social order.

Although there are many dissimilarities between these thinkers, it appears that the central arguments against public schooling developed by the anarchists in the nineteenth century have been rejuvenated and reiterated in the works of Paul Goodman and Ivan Illich.

NOTES

1. William Godwin, *Enquiry Concerning Political Justice and Its Influence on Morals and Happiness* (Baltimore: Penguin Books Ltd., 1976), p. 556.
2. *Ibid.*, pp. 616–617.
3. *Ibid.*, pp. 614–615.
4. Burton Ralph Pollin, *Education and Enlightenment in the Works of William Godwin* (New York: Las Americas Publishing Company, 1962), p. 134.
5. *Ibid.*, p. 121.
6. William Godwin, *The Enquirer; Reflections on Education, Manners, and Literature* (London: Paternoster Row, 1797), pp. 30–31.
7. Pollin, *Education and Enlightenment in the Works of William Godwin*, p. 145.
8. *Ibid.*, p. 130.
9. Godwin, *The Enquirer: Reflections on Education Manners, and Literature*, pp. 56–64.
10. Godwin, *Enquiry Concerning Political and Its Influences on Morals and Happiness*, p. 14 (Introduction.)
11. Pollin, *Education and Enlightenment in the Works of William Godwin*, p. xv (Introduction.)
12. *Ibid.*, p. 145.
13. Max Stirner, *The Ego and His Own*. John Carrol, ed. (New York: Harper and Row, 1971), p. 60.
14. Max Stirner, *The False Principle of Our Education*, Translated by Robert Beebe (Colorado Springs: Ralph Myles, Publisher, 1967), pp. 23, 26.
15. *Ibid.*, p. 12.
16. Joel H. Spring, *A Primer of Libertarian Education* (New York: Free Life Editions, 1975), pp. 49–50.
17. Marshall S. Shatz, ed., *The Essential Works of Anarchism* (New York: Quadrangle Books Inc., 1972), p. 158.
18. Irving L. Horowitz, ed., *The Anarchists* (New York: Dell Publishing Company Inc., 1964), p. 132.
19. The term "integral" does not here mean the essential part of a whole entity. Instead, Bakunin conceptualized integral as holistic, and hence aimed at consolidating and harmonizing learning experiences associated with both the vocational and intellectual realms — manual and mental labour. Furthermore, Bakunin's concept of integral meant that no mere part would be abstracted out from the totality of the child's learning experience.
20. G. P. Maximoff, *The Political Philosophy of Bakunin: Scientific Anarchism* (New York: The Free Press, 1953), p. 332.
21. *Ibid.*, p. 334.
22. *Ibid.*, p. 336.
23. George Woodcock, *Pierre-Joseph Proudhon; His Life and Work* (New York: Schocken Books Inc., 1972), p. 13.
24. Shatz, ed., *The Essential Works of Anarchism*, p. 111.
25. *Ibid.*, p. 111.
26. *Ibid.*, p. 111.
27. Woodcock, *Pierre-Joseph Proudhon; His Life and Work*, pp. 79–80.
28. Peter Kropotkin, *Kropotkin's Revolutionary Pamphlets; A Collection of Writings by Peter Kropotkin*, Roger N. Baldwin, ed. (New York: Vanguard Press, 1927), p. 197.
29. *Ibid.*, p. 161.
30. Stirner, *The False Principles of Our Education*, p. 26.
31. Kropotkin, *Factory, Fields and Workshops Tomorrow*, Colin Ward, ed. (New York: Harper and Row, 1975), p. 190.
32. *Ibid.*, p. 186.
33. Peter Kropotkin, "The Formed School", *Mother Earth* (New York: Emma Goldman and Alexander Berkman, Vols. 3, 6, August, 1908), p. 261.
34. Emma Goldman, *Anarchism and Other Essays* (New York: Dover Publications, Inc., 1969), p. 155.
35. *Ibid.*, pp. 148–153.
36. Francisco Ferrer, *The Origins and Ideals of the Modern School*, translated by Joseph McCabe (London: Watts and Co., 1913), p. 34.
37. *Ibid.*, p. 6.
38. *Ibid.*, p. 62.
39. Goldman, *Anarchism and Other Essays*, p. 161.
40. Ferrer, *The Origins and Ideals of the Modern School*, p. 67.
41. Spring, *A Primer of Libertarian Education*, p. 45.
42. Ferrer, *The Origins and Ideals of Modern School*, p. 33.
43. *Ibid.*, pp. 41–42.
44. Goldman, *Anarchism and Other Essays*, p. 159.
45. Ferrer, *The Origins and Ideals of the Modern School* (Introduction), p. ix.
46. Leonard Abbot, "The Ideal of Libertarian Education", *Mother Earth*, Vols. 6, 4, p. 118.

47. Sarla Mittal, *Tolstoy: Social and Political Ideas* (Meerut, 1966), p. 104.
48. Leo Tolstoy, *Tolstoy On Education*, translated by Leo Wiener (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1967), p. 17.
49. *Ibid.*, p. 38.
50. *Ibid.*, p. 106.
51. *Ibid.*, p. 103.
52. *Ibid.*, pp. 137–138.
53. *Ibid.*, pp. 164–180.
54. *Ibid.*, p. 170.
55. Mittal, *Tolstoy: Social and Political Ideas*, p. 104.
56. Tolstoy, *Tolstoy on Education*, pp. 251–252.
57. *Ibid.*, pp. 310–311.
58. Paul Goodman, *Compulsory Mis-education and The Community of Scholars* (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1962), p. 19.
59. *Ibid.*, p. 16.
60. *Ibid.*, p. 23.
61. Paul Goodman, "The Present Moment in Education", *Anarchy*, Vol. 10, (January 1, 1970).
62. Paul Goodman, *Compulsory Mis-education and The Community of Scholars*, p. 62.
63. *Ibid.*, p. 238.
64. *Ibid.*, p. 87.
65. Francine Gray, *Divine Disobedience; Profiles in Catholic Radicalism* (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1970), p. 316.
66. Ivan Illich, *Deschooling Society* (New York: Harper and Row, 1971), p. 46.
67. *Ibid.*, pp. 21–22.
68. Ivan Illich, *Celebrations of Awareness; A Call For Institutional Revolution* (New York: Doubleday and Company, Inc., 1971), p. 107.
69. Illich, *Deschooling Society*, pp. 103–150.
70. Unpublished Letter; Ivan Illich to Robert Chappell, July 1977.
71. Everett Reimer, *School is Dead; Alternatives in Education* (New York, 1971) (Foreword).
72. Peter Kropotkin, *Memoirs of a Revolutionist*, Introduction by Paul Goodman and Barnett Newman (New York: Grove Press, Inc., 1968), p. xxii.
73. Goodman, *Compulsory Mis-education and The Community of Scholars*, p. 32.
74. Tolstoy, *Tolstoy on Education*, p. 35.
75. Kropotkin, *Kropotkin's Revolutionary Pamphlets*, p. 165.
76. Goodman, *Compulsory Mis-education and The Community of Scholars*, p. 62.
77. Maximoff, *The Political Philosophy of Bakunin, Scientific Anarchism*, p. 332.